

DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
SPECIAL EDUCATION PROGRAMS
DeSmet School District
Accountability Review - Monitoring Report 2011-2012

Team Members: Joan Ray, Chris Sargent, and Lori Wehlender

Dates of On Site Visit: September 22, 2011

Date of Report: October 11, 2011

All non-compliance must be corrected within 1 year of this report date. Date Closed: September 23, 2011

Program monitoring and evaluation.

In conjunction with its general supervisory responsibility under the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act, Part B, Special Education Programs (SEP) of the Office of Educational Services and Support shall monitor agencies, institutions, and organizations responsible for carrying out special education programs in the state, including any obligations imposed on those agencies, institutions, and organizations. The department shall ensure:

- (1) That the requirements of this article are carried out;
- (2) That each educational program for children with disabilities administered within the state, including each program administered by any other state or local agency, but not including elementary schools and secondary schools for Native American children operated or funded by the Secretary of the Interior:
 - (a) Is under the general supervision of the persons responsible for educational programs for children with disabilities in the department; and
 - (b) Meets the educational standards of the state education agency, including the requirements of this article; and
- (3) In carrying out this article with respect to homeless children, the requirements of the McKinney-Vento Homeless Assistance Act, as amended to January 1, 2007, are met. (Reference- ARSD 24:05:20:18.)

State monitoring--Quantifiable indicators and priority areas.

The department shall monitor school districts using quantifiable indicators in each of the following priority areas, and using such qualitative indicators as are needed to adequately measure performance in those areas:

- (1) Provision of Free Appropriate Public Education (FAPE) in the least restrictive environment;
 - (2) Department exercise of general supervision, including child find, effective monitoring, the use of resolution meetings, mediation, and a system of transition services as defined in this article and article 24:14; and
 - (3) Disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services, to the extent the representation is the result of inappropriate identification. (Reference-ARSD 24:05:20:18:02.)
-

State enforcement -- Determinations.

On an annual basis, based on local district performance data, information obtained through monitoring visits, and other information available, the department shall determine whether each school district meets the requirements and purposes of Part B of the IDEA...

Based upon the information obtained through monitoring visits, and any other public information made available, Special Education Programs of the Office of Educational Services and Support determines if the agency, institution, or organization responsible for carrying out special education programs in the state:

- Meets the requirements and purposes of Part B of the Act;
- Needs assistance in implementing the requirements of Part B of the Act'
- Needs intervention in implementing the requirements of Part B of the Act; or
- Needs substantial intervention in implementing the requirements of Part B of the Act. (Reference-ARSD 24:05:20:23.04.)

Deficiency correction procedures.

The department shall require local education agencies to correct deficiencies in program operations that are identified through monitoring as soon as possible, but not later than one year from written identification of the deficiency. The department shall order agencies to take corrective actions and to submit a plan for achieving and documenting full compliance. (Reference-ARSD 24:05:20:20.)

1. GENERAL SUPERVISION / STATE PERFORMANCE PLAN COMPLIANCE INDICATOR

Through a review of student records and interview with district staff, the district has met all general supervision requirements.

State Performance Plan – Performance Indicators

Indicator 2 – Dropout Rate

Percent of youth with IEP's dropping out of high school.

State Target: 3.31% or lower

District Rate: 0%

District Response:

District Policy, Procedure and Practice: *Use of SD MyLife in conjunction with the students' Personal Learning Plans and transition goals allow the guidance staff, administration and special education staff to closely monitor each program closely. This ensures that the students receive the credit necessary to afford them a diploma as well as the incentive and support to see the program through.*

Indicator 3 – Participation/Performance on Assessment

A-Percent of districts meeting the State's AYP objectives for progress for disability subgroup

B -Participation rate for children with IEP's in a regular assessment with no accommodations; regular assessment with accommodations; alternate assessment against grade level standards; alternate assessment against alternate achievement standards.

C-Proficiency rate for children with IEP's against grade level standards and alternate achievement standards.

State Target: 72% or higher

District Policy, Procedure and Practice:

District Rate: 47.83%

District Response:

Using eMetric to assess individual test performance, special education staff will work with general education staff to address deficiencies by standard and indicator.